

REMARKS

Claims 2-23 are pending, claim 1 having been canceled by preliminary amendment.

The drawings were objected to and those objections have been addressed by the amendments to the drawings and the specification above. In light of those amendments, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is requested.

Claims 1-19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Nguyen (Pub. US 2002/0071557).

In order for a rejection under 35 USC 102(e) to be valid, the reference must show every feature of the invention as claimed. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Nguyen does not show 'paying an award' responsive to the message. The office action states 'and providing a function in response to the message,' which is not the invention as claimed in claim 1. Further, the gaming machine does not execute function in response to directions from the server. In Nguyen, the disclosure is directed to encrypted transactions originating at the gaming device and being executed by the server. Nguyen does not teach encrypting a message at the server as the origination of the transaction.

It is therefore submitted that claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 3-9 depend from claim 1 and inherently include all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 3-9 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

With regard to claim 10, Nguyen does not teach paying an award, as discussed with regard to claim 1. Nguyen also does not teach encrypting an award payment message at the remote server. Nguyen does not teach any messages that initiate the communication between the machine and the server. All of the messages in Nguyen are initiated by the gaming machine, not the server, as is claimed in claim 10.

It is therefore submitted that claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 11-19 depend from claim 10 and inherently include all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claim. It is therefore submitted that claims 11-19 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 21 requires that there be a process on the first node to pay awards based upon the encrypted message. For the reasons as applied to claims 1 and 10, it is submitted that claim 21 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 22-23 depend from claim 21 and inherently include all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 22-23 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen in view of Weiss et al. (US Patent No. 6,071,190).

Weiss does not overcome the deficiencies of the Nguyen reference. Weiss is directed to secure communications within a gaming device. There is no remote server, nor is there any

payment award messages being transmitted from one node to another across the network, in either reference or the combination thereof. It is therefore submitted that claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

Customer No. 20575
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613